



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

conclusion is also drawn that Jacob-Israel was originally the forefather of only the children of Rachel.³

The book of Joshua, then, is a source of information only for the entrance of the Rachel tribes into Canaan. These also, it is held, entered some time after the Leah tribes. Of the earlier entrance of these latter tribes, however, we have, besides scattered remnants of tradition in the Old Testament, historical information in the Tell-el-Amarna letters. The full justification or exposition of this view is reserved for another work in the future. We shall await its appearance with interest. Certainly it is plausible that in the Chabiri, Melkiel, and Labaya mentioned in the Tell-el-Amarna letters we have representatives of some ancient elements that later were incorporated into Israel.

EDWARD L. CURTIS.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn.

ERKLÄRUNG DER PROPHETEN NAHUM UND ZEPHANIA, nebst einem prophetischen Totalbild der Zukunft. Von DR. J. T. BECK, weil. o. Professor der Theologie in Tübingen. Herausgegeben von H. Gutscher und J. Lindenmeyer. Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1899. Pp. vi + 168. M. 2.50.

IN some respects this brief commentary can be highly commended. It is scholarly, but popular in tone, and is written in a clear and simple style. The grammatical forms, the meaning of single words, and often the thought of individual sentences are explained carefully and satisfactorily. The translation is an accurate rendering of the Hebrew.

But at this point praise must stop, although one might naturally expect higher excellence. It should be remembered, however, that the work was written about 1855 and published in 1899. This relieves the author of some criticisms, only to place them on the shoulders of the editors.

The author, however, is plainly responsible for the slight attention paid to textual criticism. He was behind his own time in this respect. The readings of the LXX, seldom those of any other version, are sometimes given, but almost invariably only to be rejected.

³ In the song of Deborah the name Israel does not include Judah, Simeon, and Levi, the leading children or tribes of Leah.

The chief criticism of the author, however, must be on account of the faults of his exegetical method. His standpoint is that of the New Testament more than of the Old, from which fact his interpretation of prediction is the chief sufferer. This is seen, *e. g.*, in his interpretation of Zeph. 3:14-20 as a specific prophecy of the millennium and the subsequent events spoken of in Revelation. Then, too, the interpretation is often subjective, and so not based on evidence. Of this also an example is seen in connection with the passage just mentioned, in which the author finds reference to a sabbatical year and a year of jubilee of the world's history, the former equivalent to the millennium, of which there are no indications in the passage itself.

It must also be regarded as a blemish that the author makes practically no mention of views differing from his own, in reference to matters of interpretation, possible interpolations, etc. This defect the editors have not attempted to remedy.

It is the editors who are chiefly to be blamed that the book is so thoroughly antiquated. Not only are none of the rich treasures of archæological knowledge gathered in the last half-century utilized, but their importance is underrated, as in a note of Gutscher's on p. 75. In general the notes of the editors are brief and unimportant.

Whatever may have been the value of this work when first written, for present use these great defects more than counterbalance its excellencies.

GEORGE R. BERRY.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
Hamilton, N. Y.

A CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL; designed especially for students of the English Bible. By J. DYNELEY PRINCE, PH.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the New York University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899. Pp. viii + 270. \$2.

COMMENTARIES and other treatises on the book of Daniel are already legion. But the sober up-to-date discussions of that mysterious book are few. The author of this work has shown his predilection for this task by his scholarly treatise, *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*, published in 1893, and largely incorporated in this book. As indicated in the title, this work has for its aim the presentation of a modern popular critical commentary on Daniel. The general plan of the work embraces first of all fifty-six pages of general introduction, in which we find the questions of date, authorship, style, etc., discussed with